

**From:** [Wyatt, Robert](#)  
**To:** [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [RICKA@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US](#); [Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com](#)  
**Cc:** [kpine@anchorenv.com](#); [jworonets@anchorenv.com](#)  
**Subject:** Re: EPA comments on LWG Background Comments Response  
**Date:** 09/24/2008 03:54 PM

---

Thanks very much Chip.

----- Original Message -----

From: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov <Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov>  
To: Wyatt, Robert; ricka@bes.ci.portland.or.us <ricka@bes.ci.portland.or.us>;  
Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com <Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com>  
Cc: kpine@anchorenv.com <kpine@anchorenv.com>; jworonets@anchorenv.com  
<jworonets@anchorenv.com>  
Sent: Wed Sep 24 15:49:49 2008  
Subject: EPA comments on LWG Background Comments Response

Bob, Jim and Rick

This is to follow-up on my brief conversation with Bob this afternoon regarding the directive nature of EPA's comments that we sent to the LWG on September 19, 2008. As noted in the letter, EPA expects that the LWG will incorporate the comments into the RI and BRA reports. However, it is our understanding that the LWG would like the opportunity at this point to present some relevant information for EPA's consideration. It was suggested that reviewing the information with Gene Revelas, hopefully in the next couple of weeks, might be the most productive way to move this forward. We agree that this approach is acceptable and we will consider the information prior to making our expectation a directive.

thanks  
Chip